

In re Patent Application of:
HAUGHLAND ET AL.
Serial No. **09/513,845**
Filed: **February 25, 2000**

REMARKS

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 9-17, 23, 24, 28, 31-33, 42, 43, 45, 46, 51-53, 62 and 63 under 35 U.S.C. § 102e as anticipated by Chiu et al.

Claims 1, 31, 42, 43, 45, 46, 62 and 63 are independent.

Claim 1 requires "generating a resource location description...the resource location description including the name of the contact...and notifying the contact about the resource location description for the resource." Similar limitations are in the other independent claims. The patent to Chiu et al. does not teach or suggest these limitations.

The Examiner refers to column 3, lines 42-55 of Chiu et al. as teaching that the resource location description includes the name of the contact. This is not the case.

The Chiu et al. patent is directed to a server based application which intercepts an initial request for access to documents, retrieves the document requested and then replaces each imbedded address in the document with its own address plus the original embedded address so that all future references to the embedded information will be supplied by that server.

The portion of the specification of the Chiu et al. patent described by the Examiner at column 3, lines 42-55, is

In re Patent Application of:
HAUGHLAND ET AL.
Serial No. **09/513,845**
Filed: **February 25, 2000**

directed to standard internet retrieval of a document described by a URL. There is no teaching or suggestion that the URL should include the name of the contact.

With respect to the requirement of the claims that the contact be notified about the resource location, which the Examiner purports to find in column 3, lines 57-67, this limitation, too, is not shown by the Chiu et al. reference. Lines 57-67 of column 3 refer to a standard URL fetch by a browser or server application. That portion of the Chiu et al. patent has nothing whatsoever to do with notifying the contact who is "one of the list of contacts to whom a promotion is directed" about a resource location.

In short, the Chiu et al. patent does not teach or suggest important limitation s found in each of the independent claims.

The Examiner rejected claims 5-8, 18-22, 25-27, 29, 30 and 47-48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Chiu et al. in view of LeMole et al. each of these claims is dependent upon one of the independent claims discussed in conjunction with the rejection under U.S.C. § 102. Since neither of the references contain a teaching or suggestion or important limitations in the parent independent claim, the dependent claims are patentable as well.

Further, the LeMole et al. patent is directed to a customized advertising repository server. A user can access

In re Patent Application of:
HAUGHLAND ET AL.
Serial No. **09/513,845**
Filed: **February 25, 2000**

that server through a browser and enter a profile, such as a profile describing advertising subjects in which the user is interested. When a user accesses his or her customized advertising repository through the browser, a composite advertising page is dynamically configured by the customized advertising repository server for that particular user based on that user's previously provided user profile. There is no teaching or suggestion in LeMole et al. for including in a resource location description the name of the contact to which promotional material is to be sent. Rather, a user must volunteer to receive advertising by creating a profile on the customized advertising repository server. Further, there is no need to notify a contact about the resource location description for the resource, since, in the LeMole et al. patent, the user already knows the description of the customized advertising repository server, since the user has utilized that location to create his profile and must log into it to get his pre-specified advertising.

Thus, neither Chiu et al. nor LaMole et al. teach or suggest including the name of the contact in a resource location description nor of notifying the contact about the resource location description of the resource. Neither Chiu et al. nor LaMole et al. teach or suggest important limitations in each of the claims.

For the reasons indicated, each of the claims remaining in the application distinguishes patentably from the prior art applied by the Examiner. Accordingly, the Examiner

In re Patent Application of:
HAUGHLAND ET AL.
Serial No. **09/513,845**
Filed: **February 25, 2000**

is requested to reconsider his rejections and to allow all of the claims remaining in the application.

Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including Extension of Time fees, to Deposit Account No. 01-0484 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,



DAVID L. STEWART
Reg. No. 37,579
Allen, Dyer, Doppelt, Milbrath
& Gilchrist, P.A.
255 S. Orange Avenue, Suite 1401
Post Office Box 3791
Orlando, Florida 32802
407-841-2330